

Goodwin's Weekly.

VOL. IV.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, MA. 19, 1904.

No. 19.

C. C. GOODWIN, - - - Editor.

J. T. GOODWIN, - - - Manager.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE OF GOODWIN'S WEEKLY,

Including postage in the United States, Canada and Mexico, \$2.00 per year; \$1.00 for six months. Subscriptions to all foreign countries within the Postal Union, \$3.50 per year.

Single copies, 5 cents.

Payments should be made by Check, Money Order, or Registered Letter, payable to GOODWIN'S WEEKLY.

Address all communications to GOODWIN'S WEEKLY.

Entered at the Postoffice at Salt Lake City, Utah, U.S.A. as second-class matter.

P. O. Boxes 1074 and 1020.

'Phone 301.

217-219-231 COMMERCIAL CLUB BLDG. SALT LAKE CITY

WHY?

The interest taken by the Tribune to have a formal protest sent out to the nation against the state of affairs here as made clear by the testimony of Joseph F. Smith, has a suspicious look. That testimony was not news here beyond the explicit statement as to the number of his children. The Tribune understood what was going on just as well when it sent out a solicitor and obtained 1,500 Mormon subscribers on the statement that all would henceforth be lovely and that the Tribune was going to advocate the election of Reed Smoot, as it understands it now. Hence the question is, why this present simulated indignation and demand for reform? Is it possible that Senator Kearns is having strained relations with the church and that his re-election is beginning to have a doubtful look; that hence word has come that the Tribune must show its teeth; that a bulldozing campaign must be inaugurated and kept up until the church can be bullied into making another deal? Some good men have been drawn into this, but we believe they have been deceived in regard to the underlying cause of the sudden outburst. The matter is under investigation in congress. The one thing that has caused disquietude so far in that investigation is the absence of effort to probe the real cause of the heart burnings here, namely church domination in political affairs. But in the protest of Monday night this is all ignored. Why? Is it the purpose to make a cuttlefish obscuration of the political situation and to try to lash the people and the country into a rage over the old often-times threshed out straw of polygamy? It has that look and some of the chief movers have political affinites which give new tints to that look.

Then there may be a double cross. We notice that two or three very prominent Democrats have been attending these indignation meetings and that the calling together of the Democratic state central committee has been postponed. Again, the Honorable Michael Tarpey was here a few days ago. Is this preliminary to a cloudburst for Will Randolph Hearst when the Democratic convention shall meet; a cloudburst for Hearst and a furious anti-polygamy, anti-church rule, anti-everything except to win, platform?

That is not impossible. Hearst could lose Utah, if in lieu thereof he could have raised in Utah of his horror of polygam church rule. But when it is all over, what the nation think of both the Mormons and G tiles of Utah?

RECENT HISTORY AND PRESENT FACTS.

The claim that in the organic law of Utah no provision was included to punish men for polygamous practices, but only for polygamous marriages, is true. The circumstances were these. The testimony of President Woodruff, his counsellors and others high in priestly offices, delivered before the chancellor, when the petition for the restoration of the escheated church property was under consideration, was fresh in the minds of the people. They all had testified that the manifesto had all the authority of a revelation, that by it not only the entering into polygamy but the practice of polygamy was forbidden. It was thought by the Gentiles to be sincere and the proof that it was so held by leading Mormons is made clear through the great falling off of births to polygamous families during the three or four years succeeding the issuing of the manifesto. But the Gentiles in the convention were not unaware of the conditions prevalent throughout the territory.

They knew that on the little farms and in the little hamlets were thousands of poor people who were involved in the meshes of polygamy; families with little homes where all the wives and children lived together, where the heads of these multifold households were not financially able to provide separate residences for their plural wives and polygamous children, and the feeling of the Gentiles in that convention was that if the leaders were sincere the system was doomed, and that these poor people that had been upon the rack for ten years should not be any longer disturbed by tears of arrest, prosecution, fine and imprisonment.

That the chiefs were lying, that at that time they were only waiting for statehood to resume and amplify on their former practices, that with statehood secured they would not only do as they had formerly done, but would pass the command to all polygamists throughout the state to "live their religion," was not for a moment thought of. It was not expected that at least three apostles and numbers more of the higher priesthood would take to themselves new plural wives and that such a record of perfidy would, in eight years, be made as would appall and disgust the nation.

When newspapers that claim to be Gentile but still want to avoid antagonisms declare that the testimony does not bring any talent upon Apostle Smoot or shake in the least his title, to a seat in the highest body that makes laws for the American people, we rather think they are laboring under a misapprehension, but we are willing to admit that the real cause why the apostle should be denied a seat lies deeper.

Now that the country is fully aroused, the committee cannot very well stop until the truth is made clear that the Mormon system is in truth a temporal government, in every attribute hostile to the free government of the United States, an imperium in imperio, the head of which at will dishonors the free American ballot by ordering

his slaves to cast it as he wills, either to further the power or add to the exchequer of the so-called church. When that shall be fully brought out, it will be most strange if congress does not determine to be no longer disturbed by the devious methods of this organization.

It is amusing almost, to see copied in the Deseret News long extracts from the proceedings in the constitutional convention on this subject. The enabling act required that the convention should provide by ordinance that polygamous or plural marriages should be prohibited. This declaration had been adopted by the convention, but it provided no means for its enforcement. Whereupon Mr. Varian introduced an amendment which made a former act of the territorial legislature, so far as it defined and imposed penalties for polygamy a part of the constitution, and explained that the object of the amendment was to give vitality to the naked statement in the ordinance, and expressed the belief that congress would expect such a provision. This was contested by some of the strong men in the convention ostensibly on the ground that the naked declaration (which as it stood was absolutely without any binding force), was enough.

The debate brought the impression to some of the members that there was a disposition in the minds of many to hold a hope to the lips of the country and leave it where any one so disposed could break it to the heart. This was the impression of the writer and he called the convention's attention to the man who was then president of the United States, and who was to pass upon the completed constitution.

He had openly expressed his dislike of certain Western states that had declined to accept his dictum on a subject of which he then knew nothing and on which he has never since learned anything, and this writer reminded the convention that the constitution to be accepted must be without a flaw, that while it would be a dead letter in Utah unless backed by public opinion, still it's wording must be perfect to meet the demands of congress and the executive.

The words were plain enough, easy of understanding, unless there was a desire to misunderstand them. Then Mr. Roberts took up the theme endorsing the amendment and expressing the belief that it was necessary, but objected to the spirit of the remarks of this writer. In the light of the present all his buncombe, for it was nothing else, has a comical sound.

Some of the strongest men in the convention had fought an amendment which provided a way to enforce penalties against a crime, pleading to have it left merely a glittering generality, absolutely impotent of power. It was then this writer told the gentlemen that the amendment would be of as little avail as the original ordinance unless there was a public sentiment in the state that would enforce it, but if they wanted the constitution accepted they must obey the commands of the enabling act. In the light of the history which Utah has since made, has the amendment added anything to the original ordinance? Though at least three apostles and no one knows how many lower priests have taken plural wives since then has there been a public opinion to enforce the penalties. Where do the Honorable B. H.